

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested. The objected subject matter is noted. Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17, and 24 have been amended. Claims 2, 10, and 18 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24 remain in the application.

The Examiner objects to the abstract, stating that a separate sheet is required per 37 CFR 1.72(b). The abstract **was** submitted as a separate sheet, determined by a page break, in the original PCT application. The Applicants have complied with the regulations and no change is required to the application as filed. It is contended that the Examiner is in error in commenting on the abstract.

The Examiner objected to the specification as not including a "Summary of the Invention" section and required the Applicants to amend the patent application to include such a section. The Applicants hereby respectfully traverse the objection and kindly point out to the Examiner that a "Summary of the Invention" section is optional since neither the rules nor the patent statute requires a patent applicant to provide such summary. As discussed in 37 CFR 1.73:

A brief summary of the invention indicating its nature and substance, which may include a statement of the object of the invention, **should** precede the detailed description. Such summary **should, when set forth**, be commensurate with the invention as claimed and any object recited should be that of the invention as claimed [emphasis added]. 37 CFR 1.73.

Thus, the Applicants respectfully point out that the use of the word "should" and the phrase "when set forth" indicates that inclusion of a "Summary of the Invention" section is optional rather than mandatory. As a result, it is believed there is no legal basis upon which to require a patent applicant to provide a "Summary of the Invention" section in a patent application or to require an applicant to amend the

patent application to include such a summary. Therefore, the objection and any requirement related thereto should be withdrawn.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 11-15, 17, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood (US 6,147,629).

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17, have been amended to include objected to claims 2, 10, and 18, respectively. Independent claims 1, 9, and 17, and claims dependent therefrom, are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-8074. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 10, 2006

/Steven P. Skabrat/
Steven P. Skabrat
Registration No. 36,279
Senior Attorney
Intel Corporation
(503) 264-8074

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &
Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026